

REMARKS

[1] The withdrawn claims are canceled except for claim 9, which depends from claim 1 and should be re-entered if claim 1 is allowed.

[2A] The Examiner objected to the drawing on the basis of “thin oxidation layer” in claim 5. This objection is respectfully traversed. In devices of this type, the spacing of the posts 46 is of the order of a fraction of a millimeter (page 3, line 25; page 4, line 16) and therefore the thickness of the posts 46 is of the order of 0.1 mm, while the oxidation layer is believed to be much thinner than that. The Applicant respectfully suggests that the thin oxidation layer would be impractical to illustrate as a separate part, because it would be thinner than the thinnest ink line on the paper. The Applicant sees the situation as analogous to a drawing of a painted refrigerator, where the paint is so thin that it does not change the shape needs no separate illustration. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the illustration does sufficiently illustrate the thin oxidation layer, and also believes that no separate reference numeral is needed.

However, if the Examiner thinks it proper, then the Applicant will add a new reference numeral and lead line to indicate the oxidation layer in Figs. 2(A) and 2(B). The Applicant suggests “46a” and a lead line to the outside of the posts labeled 46, as referred to in the specification spanning pages 63/64.

[2B] The Examiner objected that thicker/wider wiring patterns are not illustrated, and required corrected drawing sheets. This requirement is respectfully traversed for the record, on the basis that wider/thicker wiring portions are clearly indicated in Fig. 1(B) by reference numerals 42X and dashed ovals which show the exact region occupied by the thicker/wider portions. With this disclosure, the person skilled in the art would have no trouble in making the wiring thicker and/or wider there.

37 CFR § 1.83 states that “conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention,

should be illustrated in the drawing [by] a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box)” (emphasis added). Here, the features are disclosed in the claims and also at page 25, lines 5-12; and being thicker or wider is seen to be a conventional feature needing no specific illustration. Therefore, it is believed that “detailed illustration is not essential” and the command of the CFR (“should” means “must; ought” according to the Random House Dictionary) has been carried out by use of a labeled oval (which is just a minor variation on the exemplary “box” of the CFR). Thus, the Applicant has fully complied with the CFR.

Furthermore, the ovals in Fig. 1(B) could, alternatively, be interpreted as directly indicating the regions 42X, that is, indicating a wider oval-shaped region (rather than indicating a region within which is contained a thicker/wider portion of some shape other than oval).

However, in view of the Examiner's request, an additional drawing sheets with two new Figs. 1(C) and 1(D) is attached, and the specification is amended to describe the attached drawing sheet. No new matter is entered. Approval and withdrawal of the objection are requested.

[3] Claim 5 was objected to. This objection is respectfully traversed. The oxidation layer is described in the specification paragraph at page 63, line 25, which refers to “all embodiments” and therefore covers the elected embodiment. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

[4-5] The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ma '469. This rejection is moot, as the subject matter of claim 8 is incorporated into claim 1 and claim 8 is not rejected. Claims 1, 3, and 4 depend from an allowable claim.

[6-7] The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 6 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ma in view of Official Notice. This rejection is moot, for the same reason as claims 1, 3, and 4.

[8] Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma in view of Fukutomi '648. This rejection is moot, for the same reason as claims 1, 3, and 4; this claim is now depend from an allowable claim.

In summary, only the subject matter of allowable claims 5 and 8 is pending, and the objections to those claims are argued against above. Claim 9 should be rejoined if claim 1 is allowed, and the other withdrawn claims are canceled.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



May 17, 2005
Date

Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

(7170 426-1664

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.

CUSTOMER NO. 23995

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Telefax : (202) 408-0924